

Gladwin County Compliance Review November 2006

At its December 2004 meeting, the Michigan Emergency Telephone Service Committee (ETSC) voted to extend compliance reviews of 9-1-1 expenditures to Michigan counties "by request." These reviews would be for expenditures of funds generated through the provisions of the amended 9-1-1 Act, PA 32 of 1986 (PA 32). These voluntary *by request* reviews must come through proper channels and require an affirmative vote of the ETSC to proceed. County 9-1-1 revenues include: wireless revenues distributed to counties through the State; revenues collected through county 9-1-1 surcharges on land line phones; and dispatcher training funds distributed to primary public safety answering points (PSAPs).

Background

In October of 2005 the State 9-1-1 Office received a letter for Dale Gribler, Chair of the ETSC from Lt. Randy Lampman from the Gladwin County Sheriff Department. The letter alleged several inappropriate expenditures of 9-1-1 funds. Upon receipt of the letter, the state 9-1-1 coordinator and the Chair of the ETSC Certification Subcommittee began to take steps to further inquire into the allegations raised by Randy Lampman. The issue was slated for discussion at the ETSC's Certification Subcommittee in December 2005.

On November 28, 2005 (prior to the Certification Subcommittee meeting), Dale Gribler, received a letter from Sheriff Michael Shea requesting a compliance review. Sheriff Shea's letter expressed confidence in the proper spending of 9-1-1 funds and wanted "to dispel any potential improprieties" of those funds.

At its December 1, 2005 meeting, the ETSC Certification Subcommittee reviewed the information received from Sheriff Shea and recommended a *by request* review of Gladwin County. Pending the ETSC's approval of the request, Certification Subcommittee Chair William Charon named himself and subcommittee members Gribler, Hensel, Miller-Brown, Norman, and Bawol to the Gladwin County Compliance Review Team. The years 2003, 2004, and 2005 (to date) were determined as the time period for the review.

The ETSC accepted the recommendation of the Certification Subcommittee at its regular meeting on December 13, 2005. On December 15, 2005 a letter advising Gladwin County of its review was sent to the Sheriff Michael Shea at the Gladwin County Sheriff Dept/Central Dispatch. The letter requested the following information from Gladwin County:

- The Gladwin County 9-1-1 plan
- A copy of the 2003, 2004, and 2005 (to date) 9-1-1 budgets
- Copies of agreements between the county and PSAPs (if more than one PSAP in the County)
- List of appropriate PSAP managers and their phone numbers
- Copies of budgetary reports or journals including the line items for 9-1-1 funds receipts
- Copy of indirect costs, if they are being charged to 9-1-1
- Copy of wireless training funds, revenue journal entries and expenditures
- Name of a point of contact person

The requested information was received by the State 9-1-1 Administrator's Office in a timely and organized manner.

Additional information was requested on March 15, 2006 and that information was also received in a timely fashion.

Overview

Gladwin County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch (GCCD) receives the entire 9-1-1 call volume and dispatches for all emergency service providers within the geographical boundaries of Gladwin County. GCCD is administered through the Gladwin County Sheriff Department. GCCD's operating policy and procedures are established through the Gladwin County Central Dispatch Committee. There are written policies for operations, including a policy on dispatching the closest car to calls for service. Policies are currently in the process of being updated.

Gladwin County implemented Enhanced 9-1-1 in 1990. The county became Phase I wireless 9-1-1 compliant in 2004. Phase II wireless 9-1-1 was deployed in 2005. GCCD dispatches for four police departments, (including the sheriff department, Gladwin Police Dept., Beaverton Police Dept., and the Gladwin Post of the Michigan State Police), one county-wide emergency medical service (EMS), and eight fire departments. In 2005, GCCD received 6,468 landline 9-1-1 calls and 2,150 wireless 9-1-1 calls. GCCD logged 16,089 dispatched incidents in 2005. GCCD employs nine full-time dispatchers, one supervisor and a full-time director.

A combination of landline surcharge, 9-1-1 millage, and wireless 9-1-1 money provide the revenue for GCCD's budgeted operational costs. The landline 9-1-1 surcharge is collected on the basis of 80-cents per month, by action of the Gladwin County Board of Commissioners. Since the wireless 9-1-1 distributions began in 2000, Gladwin County has been certified by the ETSC as eligible to receive its portion of state wireless 9-1-1 funds. By vote the county citizens, Gladwin County also collects a special millage of ½ mill through 2006.

The dispatch center, which became operational in March of 2005, is in an addition attached to the sheriff department. Prior to that time, the 9-1-1 dispatch area was housed within the sheriff department. Consisting of about 576 square feet, the new GCCD addition has a separate secure entrance. It houses the communications room, 9-1-1 supervisor's office and director's office. The restroom and break room are not included in the square footage and the equipment room is in the sheriff department building. It was built with combination of county general funds, wireless 9-1-1 distributions, landline 9-1-1 surcharge, and 9-1-1 millage funds. (Fund payment breakdown shown below on page 5).

The 9-1-1 phone system is capable of taking Phase I and II wireless 9-1-1 calls. The phone system interfaces with computerized dispatching (CAD) system. There is also electronic mapping, and PC-based radio consoles at each dispatcher position.

Review Process

Meeting with Sheriff Shea, Lt. Troy Rabidue, Assistant Director Mike Brubaker, County Treasurer Christy Vantiem, and Deputy County Clerk, Laura Brandon on March 30th, 2006

Ms. Brandon reviewed the accounting documentation from 2003 through 2005 with the compliance review team members. She also provided the team with a summary report of each year. The summary report confirmed that each 9-1-1 revenue source was logged and tracked through its own individual fund. Wireless revenue (Fund 282), landline revenue (Fund 280), millage (Fund 216) and wireless dispatcher training revenue (Fund account # 282-000-804.001).

The accounting reports also showed the interest payments for the principal balances on each fund. The GCCD operating fund is a General Fund (GF 101) item. Transfers are made from the 9-1-1 fund accounts to the GF 101 accounts (101-422-703.00 to 101-422-983.001) for the GCCD operating budget.

March 30th, 2006 visit to GCCD dispatch center.

Dispatchers Jan Staike and Susan Fitzpatrick were on duty on the afternoon of the compliance review. The center has three full consoles. The consoles have radio functions, CAD, 9-1-1 call screens, and mapping for wireless 9-1-1 calls. There is no system to move the latitude and longitude from Phase II calls into the mapping system, dispatchers must enter the latitude and longitude into the mapping system manually. There is an emergency generator and all critical equipment is connected to the generator and a system UPS. There is an extended-time recorder that logged radio and telephone phone transmissions. Each dispatcher also has access to short-term audio play-back at their consoles.

Dispatch staff has close access to the restroom and a break area. There are usually two dispatchers on duty. When the supervisor or director are not on duty, the on-duty sheriff department sergeant serves as supervisor for immediate issues.

Policies and other manuals are kept in the center. Additionally, dispatchers have access to emergency numbers through an electronic database at their consoles. Dispatchers enter warrants and personal protection orders (PPO's) into LEIN and are performing a small amount of non-dispatch related duties (e.g. running LEIN queries

for gun registrations and taking calls administrative lines for the sheriff's department). (Refer to Lampman issue #1 below for further). However, they do not take any walk-in traffic or perform jail duties. The dispatchers are not trained for emergency medical dispatch; all EMS calls are transferred directly to Mid-Michigan Emergency Medical Services (secondary PSAP). There is no formal training program for new dispatchers.

March 30th, 2006 interview with Randy Lampman

The review team met with Randy Lampman in the evening after the first day of the on site review. Mr. Lampman was asked about his concerns about the expenditures of the 9-1-1 funds. Those issues included:

- 1) Dispatchers performing sheriff's department duties such as acting as the switchboard, running reports, gun registrations, LEIN work such as file checks and CCHs.
- 2) Using a credit from fire management system towards sheriff's department phone system. Additionally, calls on that system did not transfer properly.
- 3) Deputies were placed in the dispatch center, but only answered sheriff department calls. 9-1-1 wireless funds were used for deputies wages and funds had been transferred from general fund to pay for deputies' wages (Mr. Lampman provided handwritten note on ledger sheet stating "Due dept. \$23,574.00").
- 4) The dispatch center was built for central dispatching and houses other offices and equipment.
- 5) The dispatch director/lieutenant, MCOLES officer, had been carried as a FTE on the training fund applications for 2004, 2005, and 2006.
- 6) 9-1-1 funds had been used to purchase radios for police departments when 9-1-1 was in the old dispatch center.

During the interview Mr. Lampman advised the team that he was not involved in the budget development process, nor did he review the various accounts. He explained that the sheriff's department performed all the budgetary tasks of the dispatch center. He said that he believed that training funds were properly used. Mr. Lampman also raised his recent paid administrative leave and subsequent layoff from the department. (The latter issue is not within the purview of the compliance review team nor the ETSC and therefore is not addressed in this report).

The review team inquiries in response to the issues raised by Mr. Lampman were addressed as follows:

- 1) Dispatchers do answer the administrative lines for the sheriff department; however, it was clear that those tasks did not interfere with dispatching and priority was given to emergency activity including phones and radios. Much of the LEIN work that is run is done as part of routine dispatching duties. The dispatchers' performance of report running and other LEIN file checking was not substantial and the majority of that work is done in "down time" at non-peak hours. Additionally, some dispatchers request the extra work to keep busy. Furthermore, general fund contributions to the 9-1-1 system more than covered any percentage of duties that were performed to assist the sheriff department.
- 2) The team inquired about the credit from fire management system that was used towards sheriff's department phone system. The Clerk's Office explained that there was an agreement with the vendor of the software and the system phone provider to change the incompatible phone system (Comdial) in order to transfer calls properly. In order to keep the 9-1-1 funds separated, the software credit was used for 9-1-1 phones and the sale of the (used) Comdial system, which was purchased with general fund money, was used to purchase a new phone system for the sheriff department. Document of the arrangement was provided by the clerk to the review team.
- 3) Deputies were not used to answer calls in the dispatch center. Nor were wages for deputies transferred back to general fund for their wages. The document provided by Mr. Lampman indicating "Due dept. \$23,574.00" was an internal notation of the transfer back to general fund 101-422 (Central

Dispatch) of the millage funds to balance the Central Dispatch year end balance. The clerk's office provided documentation confirmation the transaction.

4) During the on site visit, the compliance review team found the dispatch center area to be occupied with staff assigned to dispatch. Additionally, meeting facilities within the sheriff department were shared with GCCD for training purposes and some of dispatch equipment was housed within the sheriff department facility.

5) A review of the training fund application for 2004, 2005, and 2006 showed that the lieutenant had been carried as a FTE on the application and adjusted accordingly the application process in 2004 and 2006. However, in 2004 an MCOLES officer had been listed as a dispatcher and in 2006 the director had been missed by Dispatcher Training Subcommittee and was included as FTE. (See corrective action recommendation at the end of report).

6) Although the date is unclear when 9-1-1 funds were used to purchase radios for police departments, the purchase of radios for use by public safety departments as a part of a county-wide emergency communications project for 9-1-1 dispatching has been deemed an allowable expense by the ETSC for both wireless and landline funds.

Gladwin County Summary

Annual Operating Budget for 2003 = 384,579
Annual Operating Budget for 2004 = 532,148
Annual Operating Budget for 2005 = 615,205

Wireless 9-1-1 Payments 2003 = 85,902
Wireless 9-1-1 Payments 2004 = 91,217
Wireless 9-1-1 Payments 2005 = 98,851

9-1-1 Land Line Surcharge 2003 = 82,378
9-1-1 Land Line Surcharge 2004 = 113,786
9-1-1 Land Line Surcharge 2005 = 142,556

9-1-1 Millage 2003 = 332,239
9-1-1 Millage 2004 = 338,215
9-1-1 Millage 2005 = 352,156

Dispatch Center Project

The total cost of the 2004 – 2005 construction project for the dispatch center addition to the sheriff department was \$228,900. The breakdown of fund contributions to the project is as follows:

216	Millage	30,000
280	4% Surcharge	45,000
282	Wireless	54,000
426	Public Improvement	100,000

Communications Project

The radio project for the new 9-1-1 center included a 70 foot radio tower at the center, new radios and consoles at the dispatcher center, software and programming, and all installation labor. The total cost of the communications upgrade was \$633,144. The breakdown of fund contributions to the project is as follows:

282 Wireless	251,813
EMS Contribution	356,231
Emergency Management Grant	25,100

Wireless 9-1-1 Funds

Wireless funds are remitted into a separate account (Fund # 282). The funds are then transferred into general fund account for the operating budget of GCCD. The expenses of the general fund 9-1-1 costs were reviewed and determined to be within the guidelines established by the ETSC. These costs include: utilities, radio system maintenance, dispatching staff wages and benefits, dispatch computers, dispatch center LEIN, office supplies, memberships and subscriptions directly related to 9-1-1, generator expenses, and telephone costs.

Land Line 9-1-1 Surcharge Funds

The land line surcharge funds (80-cents) are remitted into a separate account (Fund # 280). The funds are then transferred into general fund account for the operating budget of GCCD. The expenses of the general fund 9-1-1 costs were reviewed and determined to be within the guidelines established by the ETSC as noted in the paragraph above.

Additional

Beginning in 2004, costs of accounting, payroll/benefits administration, and liability insurance were charged backed to GCCD in the form of indirect costs totaling \$8,545.33. The costs are compiled by Maximus Inc. and do not exceed amounts allocated in similar dispatching operations. Fund balances in the wireless, landline, and millage funds are kept in interest bearing accounts and the interest is put back into the respective fund from which it is earned.

Training Funds

All wireless training funds are receipted and maintained in a separate account 282-000-804.001

The 2001 and 2002 training distributions have been used in full in accordance with the two-year time limit established by the ETSC, making GCCD eligible for 2005 application. At the time of this final report, continued expenditures of the 2003 training disbursements were made in accordance with the ETSC guidelines and GCCD qualifies for 2006 disbursement eligibility. (Accounting calculations for all training funds are done on a calendar year basis). A review of the training expenses and payments confirmed that the funds have been used in compliance with the ETSC guidelines. (Additional training fund question are addressed in the body of this report on page 4 and 6).

Training Fund Distribution 2001 = 2,089
Training Fund Distribution 2002 = 3,828
Training Fund Distribution 2003 = 6,231
Training Fund Distribution 2004 = 3,465
Training Fund Distribution 2005 = 5,735

Training Fund Expenditures 2001 = -0-
Training Fund Expenditures 2002 = 1,614
Training Fund Expenditures 2003 = 4,100
Training Fund Expenditures 2004 = 4,160
Training Fund Expenditures 2005 = 2,384

Preliminary Action

On April 18th, 2006 the Gladwin County Compliance Review Team issued a preliminary memo stating that the team had found the expenditures in compliance with the statute and the ETSC's guidelines. Additionally, the memo stated that team believed the center had been well-planned and the county had built an operationally and technically progressive 9-1-1 system with limited financial resources.

Findings and Final Summary

The Gladwin County 9-1-1 Plan was enacted in September of 1992. The Plan is current and in compliance with P.A. 32. The 9-1-1 plan creates a 9-1-1 Committee. The 9-1-1 Committee advises on the day-to-day operations of GCCD. Its membership includes: the sheriff, a representative of the Michigan State Police, a member of the Gladwin County Fire Chiefs Association, an emergency medical services (EMS) representative, a citizen at large representative, a member of the county board of commissioners, Department of Emergency Management Director, the Council of Local Government, and representatives from Beaverton and Gladwin, and the director of GCCD. The 9-1-1 Committee meets on a monthly basis.

Necessary Corrective Action:

The Administrative Findings of Gladwin County 9-1-1 Service Plan needs to be amended to reflect a current primary basic exchange rate. The current rate listed in its 2000 amendment is outdated.

Recommended Action:

- 1) The gun registration functions should be moved to the clerical section of the Sheriff Dept.
- 2) The current training program is not well documented; a documented program such as a Communications Training Officer (CTO) program should be put in place to facilitate consistency in the training of new dispatchers.
- 3) A reduction made from the GCCD 2007 training fund distribution in the amount equal to one FTE in 2004 and one FTE in 2006. Total reduction amount is \$1,249.92 calculated as follows:

May 2004 = \$192.23 per FTE
Nov 2004 = \$192.78 per FTE
May 2006 = \$424.89 per FTE
Nov 2006 = \$440.02 per FTE

The accounting system in place at Gladwin County properly keeps the 9-1-1 funds separate from other county funds, both at the revenue and expenditure side. Interest is collected on the principal and transferred to the respective 9-1-1 accounts in a timely manner. In accordance with P.A. 32, all Gladwin County 9-1-1 funds are used only for allowable 9-1-1 expenses.

In closing, based upon the documentation requested, made available to, and reviewed by the committee, Gladwin County and its 9-1-1 operation are in compliance with the requirements of P.A. 32, as amended.

Submitted By:

Dale Gribler

William Charon

Suzan Hensel

John Bawol

Leonard Norman

Harriet Miller-Brown

November 2006